

## REMARKS

The Office Action mailed December 28, 2006 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 1-69 have been canceled. New claims 70-100 have been added. Claims 70-100 are now pending. Reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks provided herein below and withdrawal of the present rejections are respectfully requested.

In paragraph 3 on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 13, 44 and 67 were objected to under 37 CFR § 1.75 as failing to conform to the invention as set forth in the remainder of the specification. The Office Action states that the claims recite cache of the printer” and “memory of the printer”.

Applicants respectfully traverse the objection, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have canceled the claims thereby rendering the objection moot.

In paragraph 4 on page 3 of the Office Action, claim 50 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have canceled the claims thereby rendering the objection moot.

On page 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Anabuki.

On page 5 of the Office Action, claims 4-8, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Anabuki and Herriot.

On page 7 of the Office Action, claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Anabuki and Herriot and further in view of Hoover et al.

On page 8 of the Office Action, claims 13-18, 44, 67 and 68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anabuki in view of Tanaka.

On page 11 of the Office Action, claims 45-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anabuki in view of Tanaka and in further view of Matsuyama.

On page 12 of the Office Action, claims 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 58 and 59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jeyachandran et al in view of Tanaka.

On page 13 of the Office Action, claim 56 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Jeyachandran and Tanaka and further in view of Matsuyama.

On page 14 of the Office Action, claims 60, 62, 63, 65 and 66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Jeyachandran and Tanaka and further in view of Matsuyama.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have canceled claims 1-69 and have added new claims 70-100. Applicants respectfully submit that the new claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Anabuki discloses that a user specifies a URL or specifies a link for retrieving, in a browser, a html document associated with the specified URL. The browser may convert the document into a format for display or for printing. A URL for specifying a profile is extracted from the html document. A profile is used for defining the characteristics of a color space for converting colors for display or printing. The profile is also retrieved. A profile call section retrieves the profile and stores the profile in cache 304.

However, Anabuki fails to suggest a print data stream referencing a presentation object. Anabuki is focused on html environment and browser presentations, which may also be printed. Anabuki merely prints what is formatted for the browser. Anabuki does not receive a print data stream. Further, Anabuki fails to disclose a print server receiving a presentation object identified in a print data stream.

Anabuki fails to suggest generating a device-dependent data stream containing the retrieved presentation object. Anabuki is not concerned with the intricacies of printing and therefore fails to suggest generating a device-dependent data stream containing the retrieved presentation object.

Anabuki also fails to suggest capturing the identified presentation object in permanent printer capture storage at the printer using the assigned globally-unique identifier. Anabuki merely discloses the caching of the profile URL and the profile information. Anabuki clearly fails to suggest capturing the identified presentation object in permanent printer capture storage at a printer.

Accordingly, Anabuki fails to suggest the limitations recited in independent claims 70, 82, 87 and 100. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 70, 82, 87 and 100 are patentable over Anabuki.

Jeyachandran discloses requests from web browsers are transmitted to a server component 103. The request is converted into a process command and transmitted to the command analysis/process unit 208. An attribute of object information to be processed and a corresponding process are designated. A command to be executed is also set. When the process having the designated attribute is performed, the command that is set is executed.

Events may be defined so that each time a specific event occurs, a corresponding process can be performed without an instruction having to be issued.

As an example, Fig. 107 shows a URL print setup screen. According to Jeyachandran, when "Print URL" is selected, a screen is changed to a "URL print" screen. When the URL is directly input or is designated by a reference in the screen shown in Fig. 107, and "Go" is selected, information is obtained and previewed. The contents that are confirmed are printed, and then the screen is returned to the initial menu screen.

However, Jeyachandran fails to even mention receiving from a print application a print data stream at a print server of a printer. Jeyachandran also fails to mention analyzing at the print server the print data stream to identify by a globally-unique identifier a presentation object not present in the print data stream. Jeyachandran also fails to mention generating a device-dependent data stream containing the retrieved presentation object, wherein the device-dependent data stream is configured for capabilities of a specific print engine. Further, Jeyachandran also fails to mention capturing the identified presentation object in permanent printer capture storage at the printer using the assigned globally-unique identifier.

Accordingly, Jeyachandran fails to suggest the limitations recited in independent claims 70, 82, 87 and 100. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 70, 82, 87 and 100 are patentable over Jeyachandran.

Herriot, Hoover, Tanaka and Matsuyama, as described in the Office Action fail to overcome the deficiencies of Anabuki and/or Jeyachandran. Rather, Herriot, Hoover, Tanaka and Matsuyama are merely cited as discloses elements recited in the dependent claims admittedly not disclosed by Anabuki or Jeyachandran.

Accordingly, Anabuki, Jeyachandran, Herriot, Hoover, Tanaka and Matsuyama, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest the limitations recited in independent claims 70, 82, 87 and 100. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 70, 82, 87 and 100 are patentable over Anabuki., Herriot, Hoover, Tanaka and Matsuyama.


Dependent claims 71-81, 83-86 and 88-99 are also patentable over the cited reference, because they incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claim 70, 82, and 87, respectively. Further dependent claims 71-81, 83-86 and 88-99 recite additional novel elements and limitations. Applicants reserve the right to argue independently the patentability of these additional novel aspects. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 71-81, 83-86 and 88-99 are patentable over the cited references, and request that the objections to the independent claims be withdrawn.

On the basis of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of this application and its allowance are requested.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Attorney for Applicant, David W. Lynch, at 423-757-0264.

Respectfully submitted,

Chambliss, Bahner and Stophel  
1000 Tallan Building  
Two Union Square  
Chattanooga, TN 37402  
423-757-0264

By:   
Name: David W. Lynch  
Reg. No.: 36,204